Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Government are not convinced that another committee is necessary.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—When students of all castes are being admitted into the Bangalore Sanskrit College, why should there be a restriction in respect of the Mysore College?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—The reasons are given in the Government Order on the committee's report.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—It is a matter of policy. The Bangalore College has been thrown open to all communities and it has been ordered that the Mysore College should continue as a seat of orthodox learning. That was the recommendation of the committee and Government have accepted it as a policy.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—Is it a just order?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Government consider that there is nothing unjust about it.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—What are the reasons which led to that decision on the part of the Government?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The reasons also are given in the committee's report.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—When the College is maintained from public funds, what is the justice in confining admissions to only one community?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Members of that community are also contributing to the State revenues and they are also subjects of the State.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—So far as Sanskrit learning is concerned, Government have been giving, to the extent possible, necessary help by means of grants-in-aid to schools of different denominations. So separate institutions can be started by any community, if there is a demand, and grants-in-aid applied for. So far as the Mysore College is concerned, there is no idea of making any departure from the present policy. It has been decided once for all and Government are not prepared to reconsider it.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Are there any valid reasons as to why the Mysore College should continue as a seat of orthodox learning?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The reasons are given in detail in the committee's report.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—This order was passed so long ago as 1920. Since then, have not persons of several other communities petitioned the Government that the College be thrown open for their children also?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Yes; and because that request was not complied with, Government have sanctioned grants-in-aid to institutions started by other communities so that they may not be denied the benefits of Sanskrit learning.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—But is that system in keeping with the spirit of the times?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I have nothing more to add to what I have said.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—At least, why not appoint a mixed committee to examine the question afresh?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Government have no idea of doing it.

REPRESENTATIONS.

No. 1.—Grant of pensions to the scavengers and sweepers in the municipalities.

Mr. A. G. MUDDURACHAPPA, Bowringpet Municipality.

Mr. A. G. MUDDURACHAPPA represented that in all town and city municipalities in the State, all municipal servants other than scavengers and sweepers were entitled to pension. The scavengers and sweepers, though they were rendering very good service, were paid very low wages and they had no means of subsisting in their old age. Hence he prayed that rules be framed by Government to treat the services of these servants also as pensionable under the Mysore Service Regulations.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) explained that it would not be possible for Government to make a general rule applicable to all municipalities. If, with reference to its own financial condition, any municipality wanted to help this poor

class of servants and passed resolutions in the matter, the Government would be glad to consider the same. The Bangalore City Municipality and a few other municipalities, for instance, had just sent up proposals in the matter. The Government would consider the financial resources of the municipalities concerned and accept the proposals wherever possible.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR suggested to Government the desirability of circularising all the local bodies in the matter.

The PRESIDENT stated that Government would take needful action on the proposals received from municipalities, in the matter of granting leave allowances, gratuities, etc., to municipal scavengers and sweepers.

No.—2. Reduction of land revenue assessment by 12½ per cent.

Messrs. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA and **A. N. RAMA RAO**, Special Interests; **B. L. BYANNA** and **C. N. NARASINGA RAO**, Bangalore City Municipality; **B. MUNIVENKATAPPA** and **N. APPANNA REDDY**, Bangalore Taluk; **T. MADIAH GOWDA**, Channapatna Taluk; **B. CHOODE GOWDA**, Closepet Taluk; **S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA** and **Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA**, Kankanhalli Taluk; **Patel HANUME GOWDA**, Doddballapur Taluk; **GURUSWAMI GOWDA**, Hoskote Taluk; **A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA**, Devanhalli Taluk; **S. SARABHANNA**, Anekal Taluk; **B. MALLAPPA** and **A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA**, Nelamangala Taluk; **Patel HONNASIDDIAH**, Magadi Taluk; **A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA**, Closepet Municipality; **K. P. PARASIVIAH**, Kankanhalli Municipality and **K. NARAYANA SETTY**, Magadi Municipality.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR represented that owing to the effects of continued economic depression, the people were finding it increasingly difficult to pay the land revenue. He respectfully differed from the view expressed in the Dewan's Address that the raiyats were paying the land tax willingly, and alleged that if the percentage of collections was high during the year, it was due, first, to the rigour of the coercive measures taken by the revenue authorities and secondly, to the temporary relief obtained by the raiyats under the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation, so that, in some cases, they paid the land revenue instead of repaying the instalments of the loans due to private money-lenders. But generally speaking, the very fact that the number of lands auctioned out for arrears of land revenue was increasing from year to year proved clearly that the financial condition of the raiyats was anything but satisfactory and that the Government must go to their rescue. And seeing that the Assembly had been, in one voice, and ceaselessly complaining against the high rates of assessment, he felt that Government must grant the representation under discussion. After all, the reduction suggested was only 12½ per cent and this, in his opinion, was very reasonable. In the adjoining Presidency of Madras, remissions had been proposed to the extent of 25 per cent. In the previous years, the Government here had pleaded financial stringency, but now that a surplus budget had been presented, and Government had also restored the cuts in the salaries of their officers, he hoped that necessary relief would be given to the raiyats also as prayed for.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG pointed out that at the time the last resettlement took place, the prices of food-grains were ruling high and so the rates of assessment also had been pitched very high. But after the resettlements, the prices of agricultural produce fell and continued to remain at a very low level, so that the raiyats were unable to meet the land revenue demand. He therefore felt that Government would only be doing an act of justice by reducing the rates by 12½ per cent.

In endorsing the representations of the previous speakers, **Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** observed that the question of reduction of land revenue was a hardy annual. The Government might have had their own difficulties in the past, but now, with the help of a band of very able officers and of improved financial conditions, the Government ought to be able to give substantial relief to the raiyats. It would not do for the Government to think that all the difficulties of the raiyats were at an end simply because the percentage of collections had

gone up. If only a confidential enquiry was made of the local revenue officials, they would explain with what difficulty the raiyats were paying the assessment. The main difficulty at present appeared to be that because the anticipated revenue was high, the Government were emboldened to think that they could afford to keep the level of expenditure under various heads also at a high level. But in view of the economic position of the general tax-payer, the Government would be well-advised in considerably reducing their expenditure by means of retrenchments of posts, reduction of salaries and other possible devices, with the fixed idea of utilising the savings for improving the lot of the poor agriculturist. If Government did not resort to such drastic steps, it would be impossible for them to give relief to the hard-hit raiyat in the shape of reduction of land revenue even by 5 per cent, not to speak of 12½ per cent as prayed for in the representation. And if relief in this direction was not given, Government would have no assured revenue for the future and would have to face unforeseen difficulties. It was unfortunate that the Dewans in the past had not thought of this question ; but it was the good fortune of the agriculturists that the eyes of the present Government were turned towards them. The present time was therefore the most hopeful for them and everybody in the State was hoping that substantial relief would be vouchsafed to the raiyats. It would also be well for the Government to note that other administrations in India had already earned the gratitude of their raiyats by reducing the rates of assessment on land substantially. The speaker would assure the Government that the names of His Highness the Maharaja and the present Dewan would ever be remembered with gratitude by posterity if only the concession prayed for was granted.

Mr. MAYI GOWDA explained that the bulk of the population of the State was altogether dependent on agriculture even for bare existence. But as, owing to low prices, the income from land had gone down by 50 to 60 per cent, the agriculturists were hardly able to keep their body and soul together. Under such circumstances, it would be unjust to expect them to pay land revenue at rates which were fixed at a time when prices of agricultural produce were ruling very high. No doubt, in the current year, the collections had shown improvement beyond expectations, but it was because of the coercive measures adopted by the authorities, such as attachment of movables and standing crops. But for such measures, the speaker was certain that even 50 per cent of the demand could not have been collected. What with the low prices and what with the heavy assessments, the raiyats were undergoing untold misery and it was absolutely necessary that Government should order an immediate reduction of the land revenue rates.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO also urged that the rates of land revenue should be reduced substantially, more especially in the Kolar District.

Replying for Government, **the REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman)** referred to the recommendations of the mixed committee of officials and non-officials appointed by the Government about 3 years ago to consider measures for affording agriculturists relief from their chronic indebtedness as well as from the effects of the sudden fall in the prices of agricultural produce, and explained how, even as the committee was deliberating, the prices of food stuffs had improved to some extent. The reduction of assessments—the subject under discussion—was one of the terms of reference to the committee. On this question, as a result of prolonged discussion, the majority of the members came to the conclusion that an all-round percentage reduction of assessment would not be the best form of relief to the indebted raiyat, and that some other form of relief would have to be devised. That recommendation of the committee had been accepted by the Government whose orders were passed on the 30th of October 1935. The chief considerations which had prevailed with the committee in making that recommendation were—

(1) that an all-round reduction of assessment would not go far in giving relief in cases where

it was deserved most and that those who might not be in need of relief would derive benefit;

(2) that the bulk of the agriculturists paid very small sums as land revenue, so that the result of a general all-round concession would be very negligible to the individuals concerned, involving the Government, at the same time, in a very heavy loss; and

(3) that the relief given in the British Indian Provinces to the agriculturists therein could not as a matter of course be regarded to be the best form of relief, so far as agriculturists in Mysore were concerned.

Government having passed orders approving of the recommendations referred to, he regretted that they could not accept the representation.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA enquired, at this stage, whether there were any dissentients among the members of the committee on this question.

The PRESIDENT observed that the Government of Mysore was all along following a very liberal policy in the matter of remissions. For example, while the representation under discussion prayed for a remission of 12½ per cent, the Government had, in deserving cases, waived the entire demand in particularly bad years. In other words, they had granted a remission of 100 per cent. It was not possible to order an all-round remission. In fact, in his opinion, that would not be a wise policy either. It was best that each case was considered on its own merits

Thereupon, **Mr. T. MARIYAPPA** enquired whether the House could rest assured that suitable reductions would be granted in all deserving cases.

The PRESIDENT replied that that was precisely the policy of the Government.

Mr. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA prayed for special concessions to agriculturists in the Kolar District on account of its peculiar difficulties which were constantly being brought to the notice of the Government.

The PRESIDENT replied that the matter would be considered.

No. 3.—Bifurcation of Mysore District.

Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU, Yelandur Jahgir; **N. Bhogi MALLAIYA**, Heggaddevankote Taluk; **S. K. SIDDE GOWDA** and **S. THIMME GOWDA** *alias* **THAMMAIYA GOWDA**, Krishnarajapet Taluk; **B. SIDDALINGA SETTY**, Krishnarajanagar Taluk; **K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA** and **GURUBASAPPA**, Chamarajanagar Taluk; **M. MAYI GOWDA**, T.-Narsipur Taluk; **U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO**, Mysore City Municipality; **G. MALLANNA**, Mysore Taluk; **K. C. SUBBANNA**, Gundlupet Taluk; **S. C. MALLIAH**, Maddur Taluk; **M. SUBBAIYA**, Seringapatam Municipality; **B. CHAMAIYA** and **M. SIVANANJE GOWDA**, Seringapatam Taluk; **K. CHIKKALINGIAH** and **J. DEVAIYA**, Mandya Taluk; and **T. MARIYAPPA**, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH stated that a rumour was current that the Mysore District was soon going to be bifurcated and represented that there was no need for doing so. This move on the part of the Government, he said, was not welcome to the public, especially as it would be in direct opposition to the proposal which had all along been urged, *viz.*, that the existing number of districts should be reduced from 8 to 6 so that the resulting savings could be utilised for enhancing the grants for drinking water wells, sanitation, village improvement, education, etc. Every time the representatives of the people asked for additional grants for such works of public utility, the Government had invariably pleaded inability to sanction them on account of financial stringency. Such being the case, he wondered why the Government should have made up their mind to increase the number of districts, thereby committing the State to additional expenditure amounting to several thousands of rupees every year, not to speak of the initial expenditure which itself would be very considerable. He also wondered wherefrom the Government were hoping to get the money, when no large surpluses were available and the economic condition of the tax-payer was at the lowest ebb conceivable. He did not think that it was very difficult for one Deputy Commissioner to manage the Mysore District even though it was a little bigger than other districts. It was but right that the district in which the capital of His Highness the Maharaja was situated should be bigger than other districts; and the Deputy Commissioner of such a district should deem it a privilege to be in charge thereof. There was no dearth of competent civilians in the State service

who were willing to take charge of such a district. Besides, the people of all the taluks now included within the jurisdiction of the Mysore District liked that Mysore City should continue to be the District Headquarter for all of them, and they were not enamoured of going to Mandya or calling it their district headquarter. In fact, there was nothing special about Mandya, whereas they had always regarded Mysore as a place of considerable importance for more than one reason.

Proceeding, the speaker pointed out that the neighbouring districts of Salem and Coimbatore were each three times as big as the Mysore District and still they were being administered by a single Collector each. If at all the work was too much for one officer in the Mysore District, it might be in the Judicial Department, and that too, after the whole of the Mandya area became irrigable with the help of the Irwin Canal. For this reason, he would have no objection to the Government appointing an additional District Magistrate to be in charge of the judicial work referred to.

The PRESIDENT stated that the idea at present was to constitute only an additional district board.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH replied that he could not support even that proposal. He feared that the result of the proposal would be to bifurcate the district into two halves—one becoming a Lingayet district and another a Vokkaliga district. At present some of the people were able to get necessary relief at least as a result of strenuous efforts, but in future, it would become impossible for them to get any help on account of communal considerations. Instead, therefore, of leading to such results, he thought that the Government could better utilise the funds for giving relief to the hard-hit raiyats in various ways. He added that Mysore which was copying British Indian examples in several unimportant respects might usefully do so in the matter of larger administrative jurisdictions also.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that even if it was decided to create an additional district, the extra cost would not be more than Rs. 35,000 per annum. Such additional expenditure, he said, would be fully justified by the additional benefits accruing therefrom to the people. At present, the non-official President of the District Board was also finding it very difficult to manage all the work and it would be really advantageous to bifurcate the existing jurisdiction of the District Board as well.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH did not however agree on this point. He thought that if at all the work was more than one Deputy Commissioner could manage, the services of one more Assistant might be made available to him. If this was done, he hoped work would go on very well.

In opposing the representation, **Mr. S. C. MALLIAH** prefaced his remarks with a personal explanation that his name had been included by mistake in the list of movers of this subject and that he had already written to this effect to the Secretary to the Representative Assembly. He added that he was not present at the district meeting which was convened for considering the subjects to be sent up for inclusion in the agenda and his name had been included in the list in his absence.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA stated that Mr. Malliah was present at the time the subjects were selected and that he could not dissociate himself at this stage.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH however averred that he was not present.

Proceeding to discuss the merits of the representation, **Mr. MALLIAH** referred to the analogy of the British Indian districts quoted by the previous speaker and said that the Collectors were so hard pressed for time that they had no opportunities of mixing with the people. In fact, he had heard that in one case a Collector had to refuse an interview even to a member of the Legislative Council. The speaker did not wish that the administration should be carried on in that way in Mysore, *i.e.*, that the proud privilege of the people having free access to the head of the district should be taken away. If people were prepared to forgo

this privilege, he would have no objection to the number of districts being reduced to 6. Personally he thought that the more leisure the head of a district had for touring the interior parts and coming into contact with the raiyats, the better it would be for the State as a whole. He was unable to understand the suggestion that the district should not be bifurcated but that an additional District Magistrate might be appointed for coping with the additional work, or that an additional Assistant might be given to the existing Deputy Commissioner. After all, he did not expect that the extra cost on account of the creation of a new district would be anything very much. There was already an additional District Superintendent of Police at French-Rocks and all that would have to be done if a new district was created with Mandya as headquarters would be to transfer the Office of the District Superintendent of Police to Mandya. The same would be the case with the Executive Engineer also. As regards Excise work, he thought that one district officer could well manage both the old and the new districts. It was for such reasons that the creation of a new district was not expected to exceed an additional cost of Rs. 35,000. This, he said, was not heavy by any means, considering that in the taluks of Mandya, Maddur and Seringapatam alone, as large an area as 120,000 acres of land would get converted into wet as a result of the Irwin Canal scheme and the cultivation of all these lands would have to be regulated under the block system of irrigation. In that connection alone, very many complicated questions would arise requiring the presence and attention of a responsible officer like a Deputy Commissioner. It would be next to impossible for an officer having his headquarters at Mysore to solve the very many complicated questions which were sure to arise in the Irwin Canal area.

Mr. MALLIAH next remarked that he could not appreciate the argument of the previous speaker that the Mysore District could afford to have more taluks than other districts and that the jurisdiction of the entire district ought to be larger in extent than all others. He could agree if the theory of larger jurisdiction was applied to all the districts uniformly, *i.e.*, if the other smaller districts were amalgamated, so that in future every district would have double the existing area.

Even as regards the District Board, **Mr. MALLIAH** said that a single non-official President was finding it exceedingly difficult to do full justice to all his work even though he was assisted by a non-official Vice-President. For instance, the President of the District Board toured in Maddur and Malvalli taluks, but leading citizens of Maddur received the tour programme of the President after he had come and gone. But nobody could blame the non-official workers for such a position. After all, they were honorary workers and it would not be proper to expect them to overwork themselves when even officers in receipt of fat salaries could not be expected to do so. On the other hand, they deserved to be thanked for whatever work they were able to do. They were straining themselves over-much at the present time and stood in need of urgent relief. For these reasons, he contended that it was very necessary to bifurcate the Mysore District.

Speaking in support of the representation, **Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY** pointed out that those members of the Assembly who were also members of the Mysore District Board were in a body opposed to the proposed bifurcation. He was sorry that Mr. Malliah was so particular about the bifurcation and that in this agitation the people of Mandya and surrounding areas were supporting him. It looked as though there was a motive behind all the agitation. Formerly, there was no wet cultivation in the Mandya and Malvalli Taluks. Now that facilities for wet cultivation had been created and the income from wet assessment and water cesses had increased, the people of the locality perhaps grudged the income being shared by other taluks and were anxious to have it all for themselves. But this, he felt bound to say, was a narrow view and would

not be justifiable since they had so far derived the benefit of the large income derived in the other taluks of the district.

Even from the revenue point of view, he said he could not agree to the bifurcation. There were lots of work of a special nature in connection with the Irwin Canal project, all of which had been successfully attended to by a single Deputy Commissioner. What remained to be done was comparatively little, and one able Deputy Commissioner could easily be expected to manage it. In fact, even when the work was in full swing, successive Deputy Commissioners had themselves remarked that one Deputy Commissioner could easily manage the work of the district and that they never felt the need for any relief in regard to their day to day work.

With regard to the President's observation that the bifurcation would cost Rs. 35,000 and that therefore it need not be objected to, the member cautioned the Government against the risk of several big taluks with irrigation facilities getting included in the new Mandya District and the Mysore District dwindling into insignificance. As regards the work of the President and the Vice-President of the District Board, he was very sorry that Mr. Malliah had hinted that it was not quite satisfactory They were both discharging their work quite satisfactorily and it would be very unfair to them to say that one President could not attend to all his work. In fact, no President had complained of heavy work nor asked for any kind of relief.

The member concluded by reiterating that since the residents of Mandya and other surrounding places had benefited largely from the income of the other taluks, they should not be so selfish as to deny the benefit of the increased revenue from their arreas to people of other taluks.

Mr. G. MALLANNA reminded the Government that the Mysore District Board had raised a loan for carrying out various works in the several taluks of the Mysore District as at present existing and that the loan had been sanctioned by the Government with reference to the resources of the entire district board area and if at the present stage the district was bifurcated, several difficulties might arise in regard to repaying the loan.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that when bifurcation was decided upon, the liabilities also would be apportioned to the two districts on some reasonable basis.

Still, **Mr. MALLANNA** felt that the question would lead to various complications and he was therefore not in favour of the bifurcation. If the work was considered to be too much for one Deputy Commissioner, he thought that the better way of lightening the work would be by transferring some of the taluks of the Mysore District to other districts; *e.g.*, Maddur Taluk could be added on to Bangalore, Nagamangala to the Tumkur District and Krishnarajapet to Hassan.

Speaking in support of the representation, **Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA** stated that he very much doubted whether the bifurcation would be helpful either to the Government or to the general public. He said that no measure which led to far-reaching consequences should be attempted without seriously considering the *pros* and *cons* thereof. It might now appear that the constitution of a new district would not cost more than Rs. 35,000, but the cost was sure to be much more when once the thing was actually taken up. It might be done if it was sure to help public interests, but that was not the case. For this reason, and also in view of the existing financial stringency, he thought that the Government would not be well advised in undertaking the costly scheme under reference.

Referring to Mr. Malliah's statement that he was not present at the district meeting and that he was not a party to the representation under discussion, **Mr. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA** remarked that he was sorry to hear a responsible member of the Assembly disowning his own action. He was certainly present at the meeting and had signed the representation. Having done so, if he

subsequently wrote to the Secretary that he was not going to be one of the movers the speaker did not believe that such withdrawal at a late stage would be permissible. And it was significant that the member dissociating himself from the representation had not at all written to the Deputy Commissioner in the matter. It was also evident that after the subject was sent up, certain interested parties had toured far and wide and held meetings and got resolutions and representations in favour of this question signed by persons attending *shandies*, etc. In such circumstances, he appealed to the Government not to accept those representations and resolutions as genuine. If they were really anxious to ascertain the genuine opinion of the public, they might cause a regular conference to be convened for discussing the question.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH explained that a regular conference had been held at Nagamangala and a resolution in favour of bifurcation passed by a clear majority.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA explained that the conference referred to was designed to do counter-propaganda after it was known that the consensus of opinion was not in favour of bifurcation. On this question, the speaker had already addressed a communication to Government. The secret of all this counter-propaganda, he said, was that certain persons who had met with disappointment at the previous District Board elections seemed to have hit upon the plan of bifurcation just to satisfy their own personal ends and vanities and set up their own friends and followers to carry on a propaganda for a district of their own by passing resolutions in *jatras* and *shandies*. As such, he contended that no value should be attached to such resolutions. On the other hand, genuine meetings were held and resolutions passed in various taluks opposing the bifurcation and those resolutions really voiced the popular feeling in the matter.

Proceeding, Mr. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA contended that certain parts of the Mysore District would be very much affected for want of any sources of revenue of their own, if the proposed bifurcation was effected. The revenues of the district as a whole had been already spent on account of the construction of bridges across the Cauvery and the Kabbini and expenditure was still being incurred in Krishnarajanagar. These parts of the district were consequently deriving the benefit of such expenditure in the shape of income from tolls and from *shandies*, etc. All these items would go to benefit the Mandya District if the bifurcation was decided upon. In other words, the Mysore District would have to go without all that income. But this was not all. The entire estimated income of the Mysore District Board was only Rs. 75,000. Out of this, one-third had already been earmarked for the improvement of sanitation and health; one-third would be taken away for roads in the Sugar Company area; thus, the balance was only one-third which would not be sufficient for expenditure under all the other heads. But apart from the question of insufficiency of the balance for meeting all the items of expenditure, the main point for consideration was what return would accrue to the Mysore District Board for all the money it had spent on the various development works in the Irwin Canal area. The answer was obvious. And the only way open to the Mysore District Board for making both ends meet would be to resort to retrenchments. This meant that the southern parts of the district would be very adversely affected, the northern portion being comparatively lucky. The member added that he had ascertained that the proposed bifurcation would involve the Mysore District Board in a deficit of Rs. 20,000. In fact, he had submitted to Government a memorandum containing all the details connected with the question.

In regard to the plea that the work of the District Board was so much that one non-official President and one non-official Vice-President could not manage, and that the bifurcation of the District Board would improve the efficiency of the administration, he was of opinion that so long as competent

men were selected as Presidents and Vice-Presidents, there would be no need for bifurcation and efficiency would not suffer in the least. After all, the papers to be disposed of by the District Board Presidents were not so many as those which the Deputy Commissioner of a District, dealing with practically all the departments of Government, had to dispose of. Sitting only for about two hours a day, the President could dispose of all the papers. Even if the work was heavy, the speaker felt that the non-officials who took up work in an honorary capacity should not demur. And so far as the Mysore District in particular was concerned, he was in a position to challenge anybody to show that the work of the non-official President or Vice-President was in any way unsatisfactory. He also reminded the House that in the event of any President or Vice-President proving incompetent, it was open to the District Board to pass a vote of censure or no-confidence and get the officer removed. The non-official section of the public was for long agitating for a non-official member of Council. That being so, it would be most shameful to confess that non-official Presidents or Vice-Presidents were incompetent to discharge comparatively lighter duties and responsibilities.

Mr. S. C. Malliah had observed that in connection with the increase of wet cultivation and the introduction of the block system of irrigation, the presence of a separate Deputy Commissioner would be necessary. But in the speaker's opinion, there was not going to be such a vast increase in irrigation as to require a separate Deputy Commissioner.

Referring to the work of the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District, he said that he had himself sounded more than one Deputy Commissioner and was assured by every one of them that it was by no means heavy. If any individual Deputy Commissioner complained of heaviness of work, it would only reflect his own incompetence. If, however, the Government themselves were convinced about the necessity of reducing the jurisdiction of the district, that could best be done by transferring the taluks of Maddur, Nagamangala and Krishnarajapet to the three adjoining districts of Bangalore, Tumkur and Hassan, respectively. Such a step would be more welcome to the public than the proposal to increase the number of the existing districts.

In conclusion, **Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA** thought that the entire agitation on behalf of bifurcation had been inspired by personal vanities and motives on the part of a few individuals. He would have appreciated it very much if individuals plainly stated their case instead of trying to make it appear that public interests required the change, that the general public were in favour of it and so on, and trying to mislead Government into an experiment which was unnecessary in itself and prohibitive in cost.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH enquired whether the people of the concerned taluks of the Mysore District would agree to be transferred to the jurisdiction of the respective districts suggested by Messrs. G. Mallanna and K. M Krishnappa Gowda.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA replied that that was quite a different matter and that the main question for consideration was whether there was a genuine demand and real necessity for bifurcating the district and whether the expenditure involved would be fully justified by the results.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY cautioned the Government that it would be easy enough to add to the number of districts, but difficult to reduce it. Already the districts in the State were very small compared to those in British India and he did not consider it wise or necessary to split the Mysore District into two. It was not also desirable to increase the expenditure on salaries which was already high and out of proportion to the revenue. Even if the work in the districts was heavy, the Deputy Commissioners, who were highly paid officers, should be made to cope with it. The general tendency was to avoid unnecessary work, but this should not be the case with highly paid officers.

So far as the special work in the

Irwin Canal area was concerned, he said that if necessary a special officer could be appointed with suitable clerical establishment for managing the work. He therefore did not favour the proposal to bifurcate the Mysore District. In fact, he believed that if the Government decided to do so, they would soon realise that it was an unwise decision.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISAMI IYER represented that though he belonged to Bangalore District and lived in Channapatna, he also owned lands in the Maddur Taluk. On this account, he had had occasions to interview the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District, but had found it very difficult to go all the way to Mysore and meet the Deputy Commissioner. He agreed that it would be very convenient if there was a district headquarter at Mandya.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA felt that there were no valid grounds for accepting the proposal for bifurcation. This, he said, was essentially a question of funds and seeing that several questions touching the welfare of the people such as rural reconstruction, primary education, etc., for which members of both the Houses were clamouring for larger grants, could not be taken up for want of funds, it would not be proper for Government to decide upon having an additional district, more especially at a time when both the constitutional Houses were in one voice suggesting a reduction in the number of districts. He was afraid that the reasons adduced in favour of bifurcation were not convincing. He added that no responsible member of the House would say that it was difficult for the people to meet their Deputy Commissioners. In fact, all the Deputy Commissioners were easily accessible to the people. In the circumstances, he was led to think that those who advocated the bifurcation must have been actuated by some ulterior motives.

Whenever the House demanded a reduction of land revenue, the Government were rejecting it on the ground that it was not feasible financially. For the same reason, he thought Government ought to turn down this question of bifurcation of the district since it was bound to add very much to the recurring expenditure of the State, even apart from the heavy initial cost.

Mr. B. CHAMIAH, who was opposed to the representation, observed that Mysore was too unwieldy a district for a single officer, as had been admitted by many. This, he said, was also the experience of successive Deputy Commissioners of the Mysore District. It was a fact that the head of the district could not find sufficient time for touring all the interior parts of the district. There was therefore every necessity for lightening the charge of the Deputy Commissioner.

As regards the Mysore District Board, he did not agree that the administration was as efficient as it could be. The reason for it was the unwieldiness of the jurisdiction. This defect, he thought, could be remedied only by bifurcating the district, and it was for this reason that there was a wide-spread demand for it in the shape of resolutions passed at various conferences.

Mr. K. M. Krishnappa Gowda had stated that no regularly convened conferences had been held and that therefore the resolutions forwarded to Government in the name of such conferences did not deserve serious notice. That statement stood self-condemned on account of the fact that a conference held in Mr. Krishnappa Gowda's own taluk had resolved in favour of bifurcation.

Messrs. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA and T. MARIYAPPA interjected that this information was anything but correct.

Mr. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAIYA GOWDA reminded the Government that the Assembly had been agitating for the past 10 years and more for a reduction in the number of districts from 8 to 6 and utilisation of the savings for giving land revenue remissions. By constituting a separate district with headquarters at Mandya, the southern taluks of Mysore would be deprived of their share of the income from the Irwin Canal area for the development of which they had contributed very substantially. If at all there was need for giving relief to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore, he

suggested that Krishnarajapet Taluk, which once formed part of the Hassan District, could very well be re-transferred to the jurisdiction of that District. He therefore urged that the idea of bifurcating the Mysore District be definitely dropped and the estimated cost of bifurcation, *viz.*, Rs. 35,000 allotted as an additional grant for rural reconstruction which would certainly be more welcome and more useful to the raiyats.

Mr. K. CHIKKALINGIAH expressed himself in favour of bifurcation on the ground that the people of Maddur, Malvalli, Nagamangala and some other parts of T.-Narsipur Taluk would find it a great convenience if Mandya was to be their district headquarter. At present, the residents of certain villages situated in close proximity to Mandya had to go all the way to Nanjangud for any sub-division work and to Mysore for getting things done in the district office. They had thus to incur heavy expenditure on account of travelling etc., which they could not afford.

At this stage, SEVERAL MEMBERS observed that it was only people from Mandya and Malvalli who wanted a separate district and that all others were opposed to the proposed bifurcation.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH was of opinion that bifurcation of any district would be justified only for one or more of three major reasons, *viz.*, increase of population, increase of revenue and facility of administration. Considered from those standards, bifurcation of the Mysore District could not be supported. Already there were loud protests from the people against the topheaviness of the administration and Government should not make it still more topheavy. After all, the budget showed a very meagre surplus of Rs. 86,000 and it might end in a deficit, if an additional district was constituted. The cost of having an additional district would be, not Rs. 35,000 as estimated by Government, but Rs. 1,00,000 as hinted by Mr. H. K. Madiah, because district heads in all the departments would have to be stationed at the new headquarters. The member was unable to understand the argument in favour of having an additional Deputy Commissioner on account of extension of irrigation in the Irwin Canal area, as suggested by Mr. S. C. Malliah. There were other officers like shanbhogues, Revenue Inspectors and officers of the Public Works Department whose legitimate duty it would be to attend to such work, including the enforcement of the block system of irrigation.

Rather than wasting public money on bifurcation of districts, he would strongly advocate spending it on useful items such as affording relief to the raiyats by way of remission of assessment, improvement of villages, provision of medical aid, drinking water wells, and the like.

He did not believe that the non-official President of the Mysore District Board was feeling any difficulty in coping with his work. Those who supported bifurcation seemed to be doing so with a view to have a President of their own with the privilege of controlling an office staff independently. This was a motive which was unfair to public interests and should therefore be deprecated.

Mr. K. KENCHAPPA took strong exception to increasing the number of districts and frittering away the taxpayers' money on establishments at a time when Government went on pleading inability to provide even the most necessary amenities to the people. The measure would seem to be all the more objectionable in view of the persistent demand on the part of the public that the number of districts should be reduced from 8 to 6. If in spite of such a demand, the Government were going to have their way, he remarked that they could as well abolish the Representative Assembly since all business which it posed to transact would in truth be a farce and all the expenditure incurred on account of its meetings a mere waste of public money.

Speaking for the Government, the FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) made a statement to the following effect: Mr. Krishnappa Gowda had repeatedly stated that Government seemed to have some

inner motive in proposing to bifurcate the Mysore District. In reply to that statement, Government wished to assure the House that they had no other object except that of creating additional facilities for the general public. The idea had not occurred to Government all on a sudden. On the other hand, it had been under the Government's consideration for full 10 years. The need for bifurcation was being emphasised by successive Deputy Commissioners. The question had now assumed importance in view of the fact that the Irwin Canal had rendered possible the extension of irrigation on a very large scale, and several lakhs of acres of dry land were being brought under wet cultivation. In that connection, several complex problems were arising day after day. If the object of the scheme should be fulfilled promptly and if the problems should be solved efficiently, the constitution of a separate district was considered to be absolutely necessary.

Some members had asked for the exact reasons for bifurcating the district. In reply, the Government wished to state that there were any number of grounds to justify that step being taken and that the Government were fully convinced that they had a most irresistible case for bifurcating the district. The speaker could not, within the limited time at his disposal, explain all those reasons in detail. He would, all the same, try to state some of them as briefly as possible. First of all, the Mysore District was the most extensive of all the districts in the State and it was also the most populous, having a population of 13 lakhs, the next highest district, *viz.*, Bangalore, having only a population of 7,88,000. Secondly, from the point of view of revenue, the *jamabandi* of the Mysore District during 1935-36 was Rs. 28½ lakhs, while Tumkur and Kolar came next with a demand of about Rs. 19 lakhs each. Thirdly, as regards local self-government work, there were 25 municipalities. Fourthly, the judicial and registration work was very heavy, the jurisdiction extending over 15 taluks. The Deputy Commissioner was expected to attend to the inspection of all the offices which it was physically impossible for one officer to complete in the course of one year. For all these reasons, Government were convinced that bifurcation was both necessary and expedient.

Some members had stated that none of the Deputy Commissioners who had so far held charge of the district had pleaded inability to manage the district. That was not a correct statement. In fact, the question had originated sufficiently long ago, with a report from a certain Deputy Commissioner, and every successor of his had pressed for bifurcation. Notwithstanding that, however, and in view of the financial implications of the scheme and also with a view to ascertain if there was any other alternative course open to Government, the scheme was being held up. Even at a Conference of Heads of Departments and Deputy Commissioners, a resolution had been passed to the effect that the earlier the district was bifurcated, the more convenient it would be for administrative purposes.

Proceeding, **Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI** observed that though several members had spoken against bifurcation, not one had given adequate reasons as to why bifurcation should not be effected, except that the proposal involved additional expenditure which should be avoided. This, he granted, was a very proper suggestion to make, but even as regards that, the members seemed to be under a misapprehension, *viz.*, that the scheme would cost a lakh of rupees or more. As a matter of fact, Government had had the question examined in sufficient detail and they had been assured that the recurring expenditure could be limited to Rs. 36,000. This aspect had been gone into more than once—first, in 1930 and again in 1936—and on each occasion, the Government had decided to postpone consideration.

There were, however, two points for consideration in connection with this question, *viz.*, (1) whether by incurring this expenditure, corresponding advantage could be secured for the subjects of the State; and (2) whether the expenditure could be postponed notwithstanding such advantage. As

regards the first question, he hoped that there would be no difference of opinion whatever, because that was a question which embraced the important issue of the development of the Irwin Canal area, a question which had not been referred to in sufficient detail by any of the speakers so far. This, he considered, was a question to which a considerable amount of importance ought to be attached. One lakh and fifty thousand acres had to be brought under irrigation. Though the scheme was taken up only in 1931-32, the demand under contribution and water-rate alone, remaining to be collected at the end of March 1935, was as much as Rs. 5 lakhs. There was also the point that within the next five years, by which time the full scheme would have been worked out, the demand under water-rate alone would have increased by Rs. 10 lakhs over the level of 1931. Such a large amount could not be obtained for the mere asking. Steps would have to be taken at every stage in accordance with law, if the demand should be collected.

One or two members had remarked that the Amildar and his subordinates as well as the officers of the Public Works Department could well manage all the work and that therefore a separate highly paid officer like the Deputy Commissioner was quite unnecessary. This, the speaker regretted, was not the proper way of looking at important questions of policy involving a considerable amount of difficulty. Several questions would surely arise and it would be well if a superior officer was available on the spot for solving them. Otherwise, it was the general public that would suffer.

He then asked whether, for the purpose of ensuring collection of Rs. 10 lakhs, anybody could say that an expenditure of Rs. 36,000 would be too much. If it could be done without extra expenditure, nobody would be more glad than the Government themselves, but after the most careful consideration Government had come to the conclusion that the expenditure was both necessary and worth while. Besides, problems arising out of the agreement with the Madras Government would come up for consideration and for obvious reasons those problems would have to be solved as and when they arose. For all these reasons Government had decided to bifurcate the district with effect from 1st July 1939. In the meanwhile, preliminary work such as construction of buildings, etc., would be proceeded with to the extent funds permitted so that everything necessary could be attended to satisfactorily well in advance of the scheme taking effect.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA enquired whether already there was not a Senior Assistant Commissioner in charge of the special works referred to.

Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied in the affirmative but added that at present, certain matters had to be referred to several local officers before disposal, which meant delay in the disposal of the cases. Besides, there were many matters which could not be disposed of by subordinate officers. The existing officers were also undergoing considerable strain in trying to cope with the work, and there was a thing like physical limitation in the case of every man. Taking all these points into consideration, Government had come to the conclusion that there must be a responsible officer on the spot, competent to give orders to officers of all the departments connected with the work.

In the light of the above explanation, **Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI** hoped that the House would agree to the proposal to bifurcate the Mysore District.

Mr. G. MALLANNA observed that all agitation in favour of bifurcation of the district would disappear if a rule was made by Government to the effect that no person would be permitted to continue as President of a District Board for more than 3 years, since that would give opportunities for a few more non-official aspirants to occupy positions of power and patronage.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that he was both pained and surprised to find from the statement of the First Member of Council that the Government had already taken a decision on this question. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was unnecesary for the members to meet and

deliberate in the Assembly, because its deliberations did not amount to anything more than a farce. The additional expenditure of Rs. 35,000 proposed by the Government was not small and the Assembly was definitely against it. He would only request the Government to note that by proceeding to incur that expenditure, they would be flouting the opinion of the popular House.

It might be that some of the Deputy Commissioners had suggested a bifurcation of the district in question, but that in itself could not constitute a sufficient reason for incurring all the additional expenditure which it involved. It was natural for Government officers to try to get more and more relief, so that they might have an easy time of it. It was not opinions of their own officers which the Government should act upon, but the verdict of the Constitutional Houses in all such matters. The Assembly was definitely against the bifurcation of the Mysore District. Every one of the existing Deputy Commissioners in the State was quite competent to manage all the work of a district. In fact, it would be a poor compliment to the Mysore Civil Service if any member of it pleaded inability to manage a single district of the size of Mysore which was very much less in extent than Salem or Cuddapa. If still the Government thought that the Deputy Commissioner needed relief, he would suggest that one of the taluks might be transferred to the neighbouring district of Hassan.

The PRESIDENT observed that this was a question on which the Government could well be trusted to take a just and proper decision.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that apart from the views and decisions of the Government, the Assembly held the view that the proposed step was both unnecessary and unwarranted. He added that if the Government were anxious to be responsive to the wishes of the representatives of the people, they would still be pleased to reconsider the matter in accordance with the views expressed by him

The PRESIDENT assured the member that the decision had been taken for very good reasons and in the interests of the State. He also hoped that even though Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar was not inclined for the time being to agree to the proposed bifurcation, he would appreciate it in course of time.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, however, differed from this view and urged that the number of districts should be reduced to 6 as had often been suggested by the representatives of the people. He concluded with an assertion that this alone would conduce to the future good of the State and not further additions to the number of districts with all the financial commitments which they implied.

No. 4.—Continuance of certain revenue concessions.

Messrs. Hosakoppa KRISHNA RAO and M. RAMANNA GOWDA, Koppa Taluk.

Mr. Hosakoppa KRISHNA RAO expressed his gratitude to Government for the various measures of relief granted to the raiyats in their Order of October of the previous year. As the raiyats were still subjected to the same troubles and difficulties as in the previous year, owing to the continuance of the depression, he prayed for the continuance of the following concessions for a couple of years more:—

1. Grant of special cultivation loans which were promised by the Government at the previous session of the Assembly, the loans being granted up to a maximum extent of Rs. 500 in any single case;
2. Waiving levies like notice, isthihar and jafti fees as well as the penal interest on arrears of revenue;
3. Discontinuance of the system of attaching standing crops for non-payment of land revenue.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the question of continuing the concessions was under the consideration of Government.

No. 5.—Putting up *bandh* stones at the time of *kissa phod*.

Messrs. N. APPANNA REDDY, A. G. RAMAIYA and B. MUNIVENKATAPPA, Bangalore Taluk; **B. L. BYANNA and C. N. NARASINGA RAO,** Bangalore City Municipality; **B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO,** Special Interests; **T. MADIAH GOWDA,** Channapatna Taluk; **B. CHOODE GOWDA,** Closepet Taluk; **S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA and Gurukar**

VENKATARAMANE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; Patel HANUME GOWDA, Dodballapur Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk; S. SARABHANNA, Anekal Taluk; B. MALLAPPA and A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA, Nelamangala Taluk; Patel HONNASIDDIAH, Magadi Taluk; A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA, Closepet Municipality; K. P. PARASIVIAH, Kankanhalli Municipality; and K. NARAYANA SETTY, Magadi Municipality.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA prayed that the officers entrusted with *hissa phod* work be authorised to have *bandh* stones of proper description put up in villages at the time of *phod* and report the fact to the higher officers immediately the survey work was completed. The mere recording in the register of the measurements of each land did not serve as a guide to the raiyats nor help them in obviating litigation. Very often the raiyats would not be aware of tho visit of the surveyor to their village and even when they knew of it, there would not be time enough for them to bring *bandh* stones of the proper kind and have them fixed correctly before the surveyor left the village. He therefore suggested that wherever the raiyats were absent, the departmental officials should be instructed to put up the *bandh* stones and recover the cost from the parties concerned. Unless this was done, the member was afraid the raiyats would not be receiving the full benefit of the Record of Rights Scheme.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) explained that the subject had come up for discussion at a previous session when it had been stated that it would not be advisable for the department itself to put up the *bandh* stones as that might prove to be costlier for the raiyat. If the raiyat would keep the *bandh* stones ready when the surveyors went there, the latter would be instructed to help them in fixing them up at the proper places. If at all, the surveyors themselves could put up the stones only when all the raiyats concerned were present and there were no disputes as between them. But even this might not be possible under the existing circumstances, because, in the first place, the raiyats might prefer to put up the stones themselves; and in the second place, the work might require the appointment of a separate staff. Again, it would not always be easy for the department to put up the stones and subsequently recover the cost from the concerned parties. But in special cases, if any particular raiyat wanted the help of the departmental officials in this direction, there should be no difficulty in providing it.

Mr. RAME GOWDA suggested that as a rule the dates fixed for the record of rights operations in each village should be notified to the village well in advance so as to give time to the raiyats to get the stones ready.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that instructions would be issued accordingly.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH represented that it would not do if information in some shape was sent to a village about the proposed visit of the survey staff. He suggested that it was necessary to see that the information reached every one of the raiyats.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI observed that this was being ensured even now by beat of *tom tom* and otherwise. He however assured the member that instructions would be issued that information should be given as far as possible to all the raiyats.

No. 6.—Boundary marks for each *hissa*.

Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU, Yelandur Jahgir; N. Bhogi MALLIAH, Heggaddevankote Taluk; S. K. SIDDEGOWDA and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAIYA GOWDA, Krishnarajapet Taluk; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Krishnarajanagar Taluk; K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA and GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; M. MAYI GOWDA, T.-Narsipur Taluk; U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO, Mysore City Municipality; G. MALLANNA, Mysore Taluk; K. C. SUBBANNA, Gundlupet Taluk; S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk; M. SUBBIAH, Seringapatam Municipality; B. CHAMAIYA and M. SIVANANJE GOWDA, Seringapatam Taluk; K. CHIKKALINGIAH and J. DEVAIYA, Mandya Taluk; and T. MARIYAPPA, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. M. MAYI GOWDA represented that in all the villages in which the record of rights scheme had been introduced, the *phods* should be well defined

by fixing stones to indicate the boundary marks and that entries should also be made immediately in the village accounts. He said that though the object of the record of rights scheme was very good, it had not actually helped the people because of the defective way in which things were being done by the authorities. For example, the accounts and records maintained in the T.-Narsipur Taluk were not at all satisfactory, the records relating to a large number of *phods* being bundled up together. If the scheme should be really useful to the people, Government must fix the boundary stones around each land as was done in the case of original land survey operations. Because though an entire survey number stood in the name of one khatedar, the land might have been sub-divided and several persons might be paying the assessment thereon. In spite of uninterrupted possession for long periods, much longer than the prescribed period of limitation, the claims of the several khatedars might not be recognised unless the record of rights contained mention of such possession and enjoyment. He therefore suggested that in all such cases, the boundaries of each *hissa* should be fixed and the *pahani* also should be made to tally with the registers. The *phod* record, the *pahani* and the boundary stones must tally with one another. This was not the case at present, and the Government should order prompt action being taken with a view to rectify this defect. If the matter was delayed any longer, he was afraid that the department itself might be unable to verify things later on.

Mr. G. MALLANNA represented that in the taluks in which record of rights work had been so far done, the surveyors had measured the different lands and done *phod* work in the absence of the concerned raiyats. *Bandh* stones had not been put up either by the surveyors or by the raiyats, so that after the surveyor had gone, each raiyat tilled the lands as he liked, encroaching on adjoining lands in a majority of cases and the original confusion and high-handedness on the part of some had again come to be the order of the day.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) enquired if the Revenue Inspector and the Amildar had not checked the record of rights operations and if so, how the confusion referred to could have occurred.

Mr. G. MALLANNA replied that even where they noticed encroachments, the revenue officers refused to interfere on the ground that they had no power to do so. The Survey Department insisted that if the same land had to be measured once more, a special fee of Rs. 15 should be deposited *plus* Rs. 5 for the surveyor's expenses. He did not understand why the raiyats should be made to pay twice over for omissions on the part of Government officials and why the surveyors should do their work without giving due notice to the concerned raiyats.

The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman) explained that some such cases had come to the notice of the department and in cases where the irregularities were of a serious nature, necessary measurements and demarcation had been carried out by the staff without any extra payment by the khatedars. He added that similar action would be taken in other cases also if any mistakes were found to be committed by the record of rights staff.

In reply to a suggestion from Mr. M. S. Basavanna Devaru, **the REVENUE COMMISSIONER** promised that one month's previous notice would be given to the raiyats before the work was undertaken in any particular village and if *bandh* stones were kept ready, the surveyors would help the raiyats in putting them up at the proper places.

Messrs. T. MARIYAPPA and CHANNAMARE GOWDA suggested that after putting up the *bandh* stones, records must be completed at once and that interference on the part of anybody with such boundary marks should be made punishable.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that the boundary marks were already being indicated in the survey map. As regards the other suggestion, he explained that if the *bandh* stones were

interfered with by anybody, it could be treated, even at present, as an offence under the Land Revenue Code. As regards any irregularities on the part of the record of rights staff, he added that if genuine cases were brought to notice, necessary relief would be given without levying any extra fees.

No. 7.—Reduction of record of rights fees in Nagamangala Taluk.

Messrs. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA and **T. MARIYAPPA**, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA represented that since the record of rights work was still incomplete in Nagamangala Taluk and the raiyats were undergoing great hardship owing to failure of timely rains and consequential bad harvest, the record of rights fees should be reduced from Rs. 1-12-0 to 1-4-0 as had been done recently in some other taluks. He pointed out that the rates seemed to vary in different taluks ranging from Rs. 1-4-0 to Rs. 1-12-0. Since the Dewan had already promised to have the rates reduced to Rs. 1-4-0 and in view of the fact that the demand in Nagamangala Taluk had not yet been paid, he requested that the rate leviable be fixed at Rs. 1-4-0 as in the case of the Mandya Taluk.

The PRESIDENT said that in the case of all the taluks in which the record of rights work was not yet completed, the rates could be reduced to Rs. 1-4-0 as in the Mandya Taluk, but that in regard to areas where the work had already been completed, the same concession could not be shown since this would amount to giving retrospective effect to such reduction which was not practicable.

No. 9.—Waiving the mutation fees levied under the Record of Rights Scheme.

Messrs. M. VENKATAGIRI RAO, Sagar Taluk and **GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGA**, Sorab Taluk.

Mr. M. VENKATAGIRI RAO represented that under the existing rules both stamp duty and registration fees were being borne by the raiyats themselves in all cases of mutations, and prayed that these be waived in future as the levy of such charges had been given up in the Bombay and the Madras Presidencies. He also represented that mutations which were over 5 years old were not being mentioned in the record of rights registers here and that arrears also were not being mentioned in Form XIV even though this was being made in the neighbouring presidencies.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the question was under the consideration of Government and that orders would be passed in due course.

No. 10.—Additional *gomal* area.

Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU, Yelandur Jahgir; **N. Bhogi MALLAIYA**, Heggaddevankote Taluk; **S. K. SIDDE GOWDA** and **S. THIMME GOWDA** *alias* **THAMMAIYA GOWDA**, Krishnarajapet Taluk; **B. SIDDALINGA SETTY**, Krishnarajanagar Taluk; **K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA** and **GURUBASAPPA**, Chamarajanagar Taluk, **M. MAYI GOWDA**, T.-Narasipur Taluk; **U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO**, Mysore City Municipality, **G. MALLANNA**, Mysore Taluk; **K. C. SUBBANNA**, Gundlupet Taluk; **S. C. MALLIAH**, Maddur Taluk; **M. SUBBIAH** Seringapatam Municipality; **B. CHAMAIYA** and **M. SIVANANJE GOWDA**, Seringapatam Taluk; **K. CHIKKALINGIAH** and **J. DEVAIYA**, Mandya Taluk; and **T. MARIYAPPA**, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY represented that in villages in which wet cultivation was going on, the extent of land reserved as *gomal* was not proportionate to the number of cattle. Further, even the existing *gomal* land was being given away for wet cultivation, as, for instance, in Kodiyala and surrounding areas, with the result that there was practically no land left for grazing purposes. In some other cases like Krishnarajapet, for example, tank beds had been reserved for *gomal* purposes, but these got submerged and the cattle were deprived of all grazing facilities. In another case, the best available lands had been acquired for the Palace and only 70 to 80 acres were left over. The speaker suggested that these might be reserved for *gomal* and not thrown open for cultivation as was being contemplated by the revenue authorities. Otherwise, the residents of 5 or 6 villages in the area, from which land revenue to the extent of

Rs. 40,000 was being collected, would be forced to vacate the villages for want of sufficient *gomal* lands. For these reasons, he prayed that Government be pleased to reserve all available *gomal* lands for grazing purposes and also to add to such lands wherever they were found to be inadequate for the purpose.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) pointed out that 70 to 80 acres of land in a tank bed would be a very valuable item and it would be well if all that was given away for cultivation. The raiyats might as well get some other lands for *gomal* purposes.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY replied that no other lands were available.

Mr. G. MALLANNA and some other members complained that if wet cultivation was permitted over such a vast extent of land, it would make all the surrounding areas malarial. For this reason, they urged that the land should continue as *gomal* land.

Mr. HANUMANTHAPPA represented that in throwing open fresh lands for cultivation, preference should be shown to members of the depressed classes, by granting at least 2 acres to each of the landless people in the concerned locality.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that the question was under the consideration of Government.

At this stage the Assembly rose for lunch and met again at 3-30 p.m.

The results of the elections to the panels of the three Standing Committees held on Monday, 14th June 1937, were notified in the interval.

Beggar Nuisance in Mysore City.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA stated that he had given notice of an adjournment motion pertaining to this subject and thanked the President for having been pleased to allow it to be discussed as a special representation. The subject-matter of the motion was such as would bring tears from the eyes of almost every member of the House. It related to beggars who had come to Mysore in connection with the Birthday Festivities and Procession and also incidentally to get alms from charitably minded persons. Unfortunately, the Mysore City Police had hunted for them from street to street and from lane to lane, dragged and beaten them, loaded them up into lorries, taken them many miles away from the city and left them in the thick of a jungle. It was not known why the police had behaved so rudely towards them. After all, most of them were also subjects of His Highness, and what was more, all of them were human beings.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that most of them were outsiders and by mixing with large crowds, they were proving to be a source of danger to the public.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA replied that for safeguarding public health, the Municipality and the Government must make special arrangements on such occasions. They could have prevented the beggars from entering the limits of the city, or sent them back in some other less objectionable manner. Instead of doing that, the authorities beat the poor helpless persons, treated them as if they were worse than dogs, and left them in the forest. Such things, he pointed out, would not redound to the credit of Mysore. The action taken was altogether wrong and inhuman. It would be most unfortunate if the beggars were mauled by tigers or other wild beasts, or if they died of starvation. Even granting that they were outsiders, if they went back to their places and told the people there that they received such an inhuman treatment at the hands of an enlightened Government, the fair name of Mysore would be dragged into the mire. The incident was one which everybody regretted and the Government ought to take proper steps against the persons responsible for it and also see that such a thing never occurred again.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA said that members of the House were exceedingly sorry to hear of the incident in question.

Mr. G. MALLANNA, on the other hand, thanked the authorities for the action taken. But for such action, he said, the position would have been most

irksome to the residents of the city as well as to the visitors from outside.

Mr. PRESIDENT pointed out that infectious diseases were likely to be spread by such beggars.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA observed that the way they had been treated was most regrettably rude. He had never expected that the authorities concerned would stoop to take such inhuman action.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA complimented the police for their action and observed that they had adopted the best course possible for ridding the city of a veritable nuisance.

Mr. G. MALLANNA added that the members who had taken objection to the action of the police in the matter perhaps did not know what a menace the beggars were to the cities, because such members lived in villages.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA however requested the Government that such inhuman treatment should not be given to beggars in future and suggested that, if necessary, poor houses should be established and some means of livelihood created for them.

No. 10.—Additional *gomal* area (*concld.*).

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA observed that the attitude of Government with regard to this representation had caused disappointment in the minds of the members. The same subject had been brought before the House two years earlier, when Government had replied that they would not grant *gomal* lands for cultivation without the consent of the people of the concerned villages and without also taking into consideration the extent of *gomal* actually necessary for the number of cattle living in those villages. But from the discussions on the representation at the present session, it was clear that Government were obviously willing to sacrifice the interests of the cattle in favour of cultivation. In a State which was predominantly agricultural, it was most important from the point of view of agriculture that sufficient manure was secured, in other words, that adequate livestock was maintained. Otherwise, agriculture was sure to be affected. The Government ought not to lead to such results. Revenue should not be their main concern. They ought to remember that cattle formed an important item of the wealth of the State, and to preserve it, sufficient *gomal* should be preserved. But this was not done in most cases. Especially where wet cultivation was going on, the Government were anxious to derive increased revenue and with that object in view, went on permitting more and more of *gomal* land to be brought under the plough. The little of it that remained was found to be quite insufficient for all the cattle of the villages. He therefore prayed that Government should see to it that in every village sufficient *gomal* land was made available for grazing purposes and that *gomal* lands should never be permitted to be brought under cultivation.

The PRESIDENT replied that if there was sufficient growth of grass and every *gomal* land was really serving the purpose for which it was intended, he could agree that it should not be disposed of for cultivation. But if there was no grass at all and the land served merely as a resting place for cattle, there would be no object in keeping it for a purpose which everybody knew was not being fulfilled, at the same time needlessly depriving Government of a legitimate source of income.

No. 11.—Sale of grass in all waste lands to be subject to a proviso that a fixed rate of not more than 3 pies per head of cattle is to be charged as grazing fees.

Messrs. Venkatpathi THIMMIAH and **Patel MALLAPPA**, Chitaldrug Taluk; **T. SHADAKSHARAPPA** and **D. SIVASANKARAYYA**, Chellakere Taluk; **K. KENCHAPPA** and **B. SITHARAMIAH**, Hiriyur Taluk; **Pathi BASAPPA** and **Kamareddy MALLAPPA**, Molakalmuru Taluk; **Patel CHENNAPPA** and **GOWDA SIVAPPA**, Davangere Taluk; **GOWDA ESWARAPPA, son of Mr. Nanjappa Gowda** and **GOWDA ESWARAPPA, son of Mr. Rangappa**, Holalkere Taluk; **B. V. NAGESHA SETTY** and **B. MARULAPPA**, Hosadurga Taluk; **J. S. MAHALINGAPPA** and **MALKAPPA**, Jagalur Taluk; **BASAVANNA GOWDA**, Harihar Sub-Taluk; **S. RANGA RAO**, Chitaldrug Municipality; **M. GURUSIDDAPPA**, Davangere Municipality and **MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB**, Harihar Municipality.

Mr. A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK, on behalf of the movers, represented that it was usual to sell by public auction the grass in all waste lands in the villages of the State. In villages where party factions existed, one of the parties would bid highest, purchase the grazing right, and see that cattle belonging to the rival party were not allowed to graze. Thus, some of the cattle were obliged to go very long distances for grazing. This was working as a great hardship in very many cases. Even in non-party villages, the raiyats were experiencing difficulties on account of other reasons. The persons in whose names the auction sales stood were taking undue advantage of their position and levying fees from individual owners of cattle according to their sweet will and pleasure. The raiyats could not afford to pay such arbitrary and prohibitive rates. Nor could they take their cattle to far-off places. In such cases the auction-purchasers derived the fullest advantage of their position by demanding their own rates. The raiyats, realising their helplessness, would have to agree to such terms, the weakest of them having to pay the highest rate. This was how, in one and the same village, different rates of levy existed. But this was not all. In cases where satisfactory bids could not be secured, the officers of the department were compelling the concerned shanbhogs or patels to give a high bid and these would be treated as the contractors. In such cases the shanbhogs or the patels would begin to collect the grazing fee along with land revenue, the fee being fixed at the rate of 2 annas for every rupee of the assessment due. This was not only causing much inconvenience to the people, but also adversely affecting the percentage of collections, since a portion of the amount paid towards the revenue demand would be deducted as grazing fees. In view of all these considerations, he prayed that a fixed rate of grazing fee per head of cattle be laid down and the amount recovered along with land revenue.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) pointed out that under the existing rules there was provision for the villagers being shown preference if they wanted to secure the grazing right for themselves. There need be no difficulty as regards the fee, because it had been laid down as one anna per acre of unassessed land and two annas per acre of assessed land. It was only where the villagers did not avail themselves of this provision that *hulbanni* was publicly auctioned, as the Government could not forgo the revenue.

Messrs. KENCHAPPA and **T. SHADAKSHARAPPA** prayed that, irrespective of whether the grazing right was auctioned or entrusted to the villagers for a lumpsum amount, the fee to be levied per head of cattle should be specifically laid down.

Mr. Bhogi MALLIAH pointed out that in certain taluks both the Revenue and the Forest Departments were levying grazing fees. He requested that orders should be issued that the recovery of the fee should be made by only one of the departments.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that Government would consider whether the maximum fee leviable per head of cattle could not be mentioned in the auction *patti* itself.

No. 12.—Raiyats' right to enjoy the usufruct of the avenue trees planted and reared by them.

Messrs. Venkalpathi THIMMIAH and **Patel MALLAPPA,** Chitaldrug Taluk; **T. SHADAKSHARAPPA** and **D. SIVASANKARAYYA,** Chellakere Taluk; **K. KENCHAPPA** and **B. SITHARAMIAH,** Hiriyur Taluk; **Pathi BASAPPA** and **Kamareddy MALLAPPA,** Molakalmuru Taluk; **Patel CHENNAPPA** and **GOWDA SIVAPPA,** Davangere Taluk; **GOWDA ESWARAPPA, son of Mr. Nanjappa Gowda** and **GOWDA ESWARAPPA, son of Mr. Rangappa,** Holalkere Taluk; **B. V. NAGESHA SETTY** and **B. MARULAPPA,** Hosadurga Taluk; **J. S. MAHALINGAPPA** and **MALKAPPA,** Jagalur Taluk; **BASAVANNA GOWDA,** Harihar Sub-Taluk; **S. RANGA RAO,** Chitaldrug Municipality; **M. GURUSIDDAPPA,** Davangere Municipality and **MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB,** Harihar Municipality.

Mr. Pathi BASAPPA observed that the avenue trees in the State were planted and reared by the raiyats of the adjoining villages and for this reason, the raiyats had been enjoying

the usufruct of the trees from the very beginning. Of late, however, Government had begun to sell the usufruct by public auction during *jamabandy*. The revenue offices had no records of their own to show who had planted the trees and such records as the villagers were able to produce to show that their ancestors had planted the trees, were disbelieved by the local officers. He prayed that the raiyats should not be deprived of their rights in this respect but that the usufruct of the trees should be allowed to be enjoyed by them alone as before.

Mr. T. V. NARASINGAPPA brought to notice that in some cases, the villagers would have no knowledge as to the exact time when the *jamabandy* was going to be held. Very often it began late in the evening and ended at midnight. On that account, both the subordinate officials as well as the villagers were put to a lot of difficulties. He added that if persons whose presence was required at the *jamabandy* did not appear on account of the lateness of the hour, the *jamabandy* officers caused them to be dragged to the village *chavdi*.

A large number of other members also complained about the lateness of *jamabandy* hours.

The PRESIDENT replied that *jamabandy* ought not to be conducted at such late hours and promised that needful instructions would issue in the matter.

No. 13.—Adjustment of contribution and water-rate on lands under the Irwin Canal area.

Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU, Yalandur Jahgir; **N. Bhogi MALLAIYA**, Heggaddevankote Taluk; **S. K. SIDDE GOWDA** and **S. THIMME GOWDA** *alias* **THAMMAIYA GOWDA**, Krishnarajapet Taluk; **B. SIDDALINGA SETTY**, Krishnarajanagar Taluk; **K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA** and **GURUBASAPPA**, Chamarajanagar Taluk; **M. MAYI GOWDA**, T.-Narsipur Taluk; **U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO**, Mysore City Municipality; **G. MALLANNA**, Mysore Taluk; **K. C. SUBBANNA**, Gundlupet Taluk; **S. C. MALLIAH**, Maddur Taluk; **M. SUBBIAH**, Seringapatam Municipality; **B. CHAMAIYA** and **M. SIVANANJE GOWDA**, Seringapatam Taluk; **K. CHIKKALINGIAH** and **J. DEVAIYA**, Mandya Taluk and **T. MARIYAPPA**, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. K. CHIKKALINGIAH brought to notice certain irregularities which were occurring in the adjustment of contribution and water-rate out of the amount paid to the raiyats by the Sugar Company for the sugar-cane supplied to them. He represented that sometimes more than what was due from the landowners towards contribution and water-rate on lands under the Irwin Canal was being recovered and in some others, contribution due on lands other than those on which sugar-cane was actually grown was also being adjusted. He prayed that only that part of the contribution and water-rate due on lands on which sugar-cane was actually cultivated should be adjusted.

He next brought to notice that in regard to such excess recoveries, although refund applications were presented, refunds were not being made. In some cases, endorsements were given stating that the excess recoveries would be adjusted against the following year's revenue dues. This, he contended, was extremely hard for the raiyats. Even in cases in which the raiyats represented their grievance to the Deputy Commissioner and the Revenue Commissioner, no action had been taken so far. If the raiyats thought of waiting in deputation on the Dewan and the Members of Council, the local officials might get prejudiced and report to the Government that such persons were going out of bounds. The officials would not hesitate even to apply some of the provisions of the Police Regulation to them with a view to restrict their movements. The member requested Government not to entertain such a low opinion of the raiyats of Mandya, Maddur and Seringapatam, and to order the refund of all excess recoveries.

The member then represented that even as regards the amounts actually recovered by adjustment, the officers were not giving necessary details to the raiyats at the time of the adjustment. The speaker prayed that an open record be maintained at the taluk headquarter which should be made available for reference by the raiyats or their representatives without any fee being

levied for it. He also prayed that a detailed account of the amount due by the Company, amount adjusted on account of contribution and water-rate, and the amount actually paid to the raiyat, should be given by the authorities, so that the raiyat might know his position at any given time.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that on certificates issued by an officer of and above the status of an Amildar, amounts due by the raiyats could be adjusted out of the amounts due to them by the factory. If anything more than was admissible was adjusted, then, it would be opposed to rules. In certain cases, however, some other items, such as the value of seed supplied to the cane-growers, etc., were also being adjusted, according to the terms of *mutchalikas* executed by the raiyats themselves. But in some cases, excess recoveries might have been made under a mistake. And with a view to prevent such things recurring in future, it was proposed to appoint a special clerk whose duty it would be to see that the correct demand was fixed before adjustments were actually made. When this was done, the speaker hoped there would be no occasion for complaints like the above.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH represented that the present system of adjusting all the revenue dues from out of the amount payable by the Sugar Company was causing inconvenience to the raiyats for the reason that sugar-cane was grown only on a small portion of a raiyat's holding so that the amount due by the Sugar Company would not be anything very much, whereas the land revenue due on the entire holding might sometimes amount to almost all the money due by the Company. In other words, if out of the cost of the sugar-cane supplied, the entire amount of land revenue was deducted, very little might be left in the hands of the raiyat for all his other expenses.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) remarked that it would not matter much whether the revenue dues were paid entirely by adjustment of the money due by the Factory or partly by such adjustment and partly by direct payment from other moneys of the raiyats.

The PRESIDENT replied that there did not seem to be any real grievance on account of the adjustment complained of.

No. 15.—Recovery of fine and extra upset price, etc., on dry lands used for coffee cultivation.

Mr. KRISHNA RAO GANESHA RAO GURUJAR, Special Interests.

Mr. KRISHNA RAO GANESHA RAO GURUJAR represented that in cases where coffee planters and others improved the dry lands in their holdings by growing coffee, etc., the revenue authorities were levying heavy fines and extra upset price, treating the cultivation as unauthorised. He prayed that it be ruled that owners might raise on their dry lands any crop—coffee, wet or garden—till the following revision settlement or that whatever crops were raised on dry lands, the rate of assessment (upset price and fine excepting) be fixed only when the plants, etc., were fully grown and began to yield.

The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman) pointed out that there would be no difficulty if they obtained permission before hand.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that he would consider the representation after looking into the opinion of the Survey Superintendent in the matter.

No. 16.—Reduction of assessment on areca-bagayet lands in malnad parts.

Mr. S. SUBBA RAO, Tirthahalli Taluk.

Mr. S. SUBBA RAO, in representing the difficulties of the areca-bagayet land-holders in the malnad parts, stated that for the past several years, the price of areca had fallen so low that the planters could not realise even the cost of cultivation by selling their produce. This was acting as a great setback to the industry itself. The Government were under the impression that simply because 90 per cent of the revenue demand had been collected during the current year, the economic

position of the raiyats had considerably improved. But he would assure the Government that that impression was not correct. The raiyats had already sold their gold merely for paying the assessment in the previous year. In 1936-37 they had no other means of paying it, and so they had prayed for time for payment. But that request was not complied with. They had no more gold left with them. So, just to keep up their honour, they had to sell away the better part of their livestock for meeting the current year's revenue demand. And on this account, their difficulties had increased considerably and it was feared that in the following rainy season, the agriculturists might find it hard even to keep their bodies and souls together. He therefore prayed that the rate of assessment on areca-bagayet lands in the malnad—at any rate in the frontier taluks of the malnad—be reduced by 33⅓ per cent permanently, or at least till such time as the price of arecanut improved.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA reminded the First Member of Council that when he visited Shikarpur during his tour in the Shimoga District, representations were made in the matter and that the Member was pleased to promise sympathetic consideration of the question of granting relief to the areca planters. The speaker was sorry that as yet no relief had been given to them. He represented that the assessment on areca-bagayet lands was as high as Rs. 18 to Rs. 22 per acre, and in view of the scarcity of labour in those parts, heavy wages had to be paid so that the cost of cultivation was also very heavy. In fact, the planters were finding that the cost of cultivation was more than the income. Under such circumstances, the raiyats were feeling considerable difficulty to pay land revenue and stood in urgent need of relief. The speaker therefore urged that the relief prayed for in the representation be granted as early as possible.

Mr. Bhupalam CHANDRASEKHARA SETTY supported the representation and added that the total yield of arecanut in the Shimoga District alone had gone down by as much as one lakh of maunds in the last harvest.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the subject-matter of the representation had been considered on several occasions, once by the Committee appointed to enquire into the economic conditions in the malnad, and again by the Agriculturists' Relief Committee, and both the committees had taken the view that no reduction of assessment was called for under the circumstances then prevailing. The price of areca was very much lower then than at present. In the opinion of the Government, therefore, conditions were better at present than before, and so he said that it was not necessary to reduce the assessment as prayed for in the representation.

No. 17.—Establishment of a Debt Conciliation Board at Turuvekere.

Mr. HANUME GOWDA, Turuvekere Sub-Taluk.

Mr. HANUME GOWDA prayed that a Debt Conciliation Board be established at Turuvekere in order to give relief to the debtors of the sub-taluk.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the Debt Conciliation Regulation had been placed on the Statute Book only recently and that rules under the Regulation were being framed. As soon as this was done, the question of the areas to which the Regulation should be extended would be taken up for consideration.

No. 22.—Grant of free license for transport of galnut produce from occupied lands.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH, Arkalgud Taluk.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH represented that prior to 1931 the obtaining of license was not being insisted upon for collecting and transporting galnut produce from occupied lands. But at present, two kinds of licenses were being insisted upon, one for collecting the produce and another for transporting it. If galnut was not collected soon after it dropped from the tree, it would rot. Collection therefore had to be done promptly. But it was not

easy to obtain a license quickly. The procedure prescribed for it was both elaborate and difficult. To begin with, the occupant of the land had to go to the taluk office which was often far away, execute a *mutchalika* and get it registered in the taluk office; then he should go to the Revenue Inspector and through him apply for a license. At that stage, the contractor concerned should signify his consent to a license being granted, and this meant that the occupant must meet the contractor's agents and enlist their sympathy. The contractor would fix up a date and the occupant would have to wait till such a day when they would both go to the land for collecting the nut. But before the nut could be removed, a second license was to be obtained. For that, a *mahazar* would have to be drawn up before the patel about the exact quantity collected. With that *mahazar*, the party had to approach the Amildar and obtain the license. By the time all this process was gone through, the bulk of the nut would have disappeared and the little that remained would have nearly perished. The difficulties of the occupant were thus untold. The member therefore prayed that the rule requiring private occupants to obtain licenses every year be cancelled and that the rules be so modified as to provide for the grant of a free pass once for all, the quantity of nut to be permitted to be removed being fixed on the basis of the average yield in each case. Personally, he would prefer the system of licenses being done away with altogether as in the past. After all, galnut was not an item from which Government derived much revenue. But if this was not possible, the other alternative of issuing free passes should be ordered to be followed as the next best course.

Mr. MAHOMED MUSTAPHA SAHIB, speaking against the representation, said that if the obtaining of licenses was made an easy task, forests would be denuded at no distant date. In Chikballapur, for example, cases of theft were detected and several bags of galnut recovered. The contractor could not always be expected to remain in the forest itself and it was difficult to detect such cases. The present rule was very good, and if the system of licenses was dispensed with, the Government would lose all their revenue from minor forest produce.

The PRESIDENT replied that it was not found necessary to modify the existing rules in any respect.

No. 36.—Munsiff-Magistrate's Court at Krishnarajanagara.

Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU, Yelandur Jahgir; N. Bhogi MALLAIYA, Heggaddevankote Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAIYA GOWDA, Krishnarajapet Taluk; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Krishnarajanagar Taluk; K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA and GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; M. MAYI GOWDA-T.-Narsipur Taluk; U. L. RAMACHAN, DRA RAO, Mysore City Municipality; G. MALLANNA, Mysore Taluk; K. C. SUBBANNA, Gundlupet Taluk; S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk; M. SUBBIAH, Seringapatam Municipality; B. CHAMAIYA and M. SIVANANJE GOWDA, Seringapatam Taluk; K. CHIKKALINGIAH and J. DEVAIYA, Mandya Taluk and T. MARIYAPPA, Nagamangala Taluk.

Mr. B. SIDDALINGA SETTY prayed that an independent Munsiff-Magistrate's Court be established for the Krishnarajanagar Taluk at Krishnarajanagar and the taluk excluded from the jurisdiction of the Hunsur Court.

The PRESIDENT replied that the matter was under the consideration of the Government.

No. 40.—Abolition of the distinction made between Anglo-Indians and Indians in the Police Department.

Messrs. C. N. NARASINGA RAO and B. L. BYANNA (Bangalore City Municipality); B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY (Bangalore Taluk); B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO (Special Interests); T. MADIAH GOWDA (Channapatna Taluk); B. CHOODE GOWDA (Closepet Taluk); S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA and Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA (Kankanhalli Taluk); Patel HANUME GOWDA (Dodballapur Taluk); GURUSWAMI GOWDA (Hoskote Taluk); A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA (Devanahalli Taluk); S. SARABHANNA (Anekal Taluk); B. MALLAPPA and A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA (Nelamangala Taluk); Patel HONNASIDDIAH (Magadi Taluk);

A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA (Closepet Municipality); **K. P. PARASIVIAH** (Kankanhalli Municipality): and **K. NARAYANA SETTY** (Magadi Municipality).

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO regretted that for some time past, a distinction was being made in the Police Department as between Anglo-Indians and Indians. A separate class had been created in the department for Anglo-Indians and these were being given special pay and allowances. He thought that this distinction had created discontent on the part of other members in the service. If Anglo-Indians were considered efficient for traffic work, he would have no objection to a separate branch being created and special hands being recruited, not on communal basis, but on the basis of merit. He pointed out that it would be a blot on the fair name of Mysore if communal considerations should become the basis for appointments in the department. He was of opinion that the sooner the system of appointment on colour basis was abolished, the better. If the Government thought that the wearing of hats was a sign of efficiency, he would have no objection to the other members of the constabulary also being asked to wear them so that all might become efficient.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the recruitments complained against were not meant to give special encouragement to Anglo-Indians. The men under reference had been appointed because they had been specially trained in traffic control. Now that motor bus traffic had developed very much in the city and the Traffic Regulation had to be enforced strictly, it was thought that these people, who had a knack for that particular kind of work, would be the proper men to do the work. If the members dispassionately examined the work done by these and saw things for themselves, he was sure they would easily grant that these people were more competent to do traffic work than the ordinary constables. He did not mean to say that the other men were incompetent but it was a fact that certain men did special kinds of work better than certain others.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA pointed out that Indian sepoys had obtained distinctions in wars and won medals, and so it might not be proper to under-estimate Indians in the matter of less onerous duties.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA regretted that a statement from the member of Council to the effect that Anglo-Indians alone had a knack for the regulation of traffic would amount to casting a slur on others.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI observed that his statement should not be viewed in that light. All that he meant was that for purposes of traffic control, Anglo-Indians had been recruited, the reason being that they were better suited for such work. And because the standard of living of these people was somewhat higher, a slightly higher scale of pay was given to them.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO stated that he would have no objection to Government employing anybody who had a knack for any particular kind of work. His only point was that nobody should be given a higher pay on the basis of colour.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that if the members so desired, a special Branch called "Special Traffic Force" could be constituted and these specially trained hands recruited thereto. But he thought that even such a step would not make any difference.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER observed that since these men were recruited specially for traffic work, they should be kept in the traffic branch alone for all time and not transferred to the general line at any time in future.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that it was not possible to say all that at present and that all he could say was that these men were recruited for traffic work specially, as experience had shown that these people were better fitted for such work.

No. 42.—Modifying the rules regarding the grant of gun licenses.

Mr. H. B. SIVAPPA, Manjarabad Taluk.

Mr. H. B. SIVAPPA represented that two kinds of licenses were being issued for possession of guns. License in Form No. IX was being granted for self-protection, and sporting license in Form No. XI for protection of raiyats' cattle and crop. This, he represented, was very inconvenient for the raiyat. After shooting with a muzzle-loader, at least 10 minutes' time would be required to re-load it if a person had to shoot wild beasts to ward off danger from them. In the interval, there was the danger of the wild beasts attacking the person. Government had framed rules to the effect that a raiyat paying an assessment of Rs. 30 might be granted a license in Form XI for a muzzle-loading gun, that too of a short barrel—not exceeding one foot in length—and that a license in Form No. IX might be granted to a raiyat paying an assessment of not less than Rs. 200. He had also come to know that 83 per cent of the licenses granted had been issued in Form No. IX for big landlords and other influential persons. This did not in any way help the poor raiyat. By the introduction of the Record of Rights Scheme there was no scope also to pay larger amount of *kandayam* as *khates* were separately made in the name of each *hissedar*. He therefore prayed that the rules be so modified that each landholder paying an assessment of not less than Rs. 5 in the malnad parts be granted a license to possess a gun without any distinction as to the kind of weapon, whether a breach-loader or a muzzle-loader.

Mr. ALFRED MIDDLETON spoke against the representation. He thought that 10 minutes' time was too long for re-loading the gun and that a couple of minutes would suffice for it. At any rate, that was his experience. Where, however, a muzzle-loader had two barrels, the raiyat would have the second barrel to protect himself.

He was of opinion that the property qualification required at present for the grant of license for possessing a muzzle-loading gun was not too high. He was sure that by lowering the property qualification, as prayed for in the representation, there would be scope for even more indiscriminate shooting of animals in forests than at present. Even with the existing property qualification, as many as 30,000 licenses had been issued in the whole State, of which as many as 4,000 to 5,000 each had been issued in Hassan and Kadur Districts. And it should be remembered that these figures did not include the great number of cases in which guns were possessed without proper licenses. In most cases the raiyats were not caring for the game laws which were practically a dead letter; and due to indiscriminate shooting, even protected animals like jungle-sheep and deer had become practically extinct. Even pigs were becoming rare, despite the largeness of litter born of these animals. So, tigers, finding no food in the forest, were being compelled to go to the nearest villages in quest of prey and carry away cattle, sheep and other animals and this accounted for the supposed increase in the number of tigers. The raiyats would do well to remember that, more than the tiger, it was the wild dog that had to be dreaded. It could well be compared to the Chicago gangster. It was more destructive and harmful than the tiger. As between the two, it could be said that the tiger was a "gentleman." In the Chamarajanagar Taluk, for example, he was informed that wild dogs had commenced to prey upon cattle, etc., and might soon start doing likewise in other districts. So, the speaker was of opinion that indiscriminate shooting of protected animals was the real cause for tigers and other wild animals getting into villages and carrying away cattle and other livestock. For these reasons, he thought that the property qualification should not be lowered. He did not mind, however, whether the license was granted in Form No. IX or XI.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED SAB pointed out that Mr. Middleton was always accompanied by hunting dogs wherever he went and as soon as they scented wild beasts, he could get ready to shoot them down. But the poor raiyats could not afford to keep hunting dogs and they could not anticipate when and where danger lay. He therefore

urged that sporting licenses should be issued to the raiyats as prayed for in the representation.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB pointed out that in the instructions recently issued by the Government to District Magistrates, a suggestion had been included to the effect that ordinarily, if the land revenue paid by a raiyat amounted to Rs. 200, his license might be renewed in Form No. IX. The taluk authorities had taken this suggestion as a regular Government Order and interpreted it to mean that even licenses already granted to raiyats who paid an assessment of less than Rs. 200 should be cancelled. Accordingly, wholesale cancellation of licenses had been going on. The effect of such action on their part was not felt so much in the maidan parts, as self-protection therein was not such a difficult job. But as regards malnad parts, danger from wild beasts was a common feature, and withdrawal of licenses was working as a great hardship on the raiyat. Besides, the political situation in the Mysore State was not such as to warrant any special limitations in the matter of gun licenses. He therefore requested that orders be issued that wholesale cancellation of licenses should not be resorted to by the local authorities.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that Government had just taken up for consideration the report of the Game Laws Committee presided over by Sir Charles Todhunter, and that the subject-matter of this representation was one of the points referred to in that report.

No. 61.—Empowering land mortgage co-operative societies to grant loans from Rs. 250 and upwards.

Mr. M. VENKATAGIRI RAO, Sagar Taluk.

Mr. M. VENKATAGIRI RAO prayed that the land mortgage co-operative societies be empowered to sanction loans of Rs. 250 and above instead of Rs. 500 and upwards, which they were now permitted to grant, in order that a larger number of people might be helped.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that the Committee on Co-operation had recommended that the limit be reduced from Rs. 500 to Rs. 300 and that the recommendation had been approved by the Government.

No. 76.—Constituting village panchayat boards for each taluk and holding village panchayat conferences.

Messrs. T. MADIAH GOWDA, Channapatna Taluk; B. L. BYANNA and C. N. NARASINGA RAO, Bangalore City Municipality; B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY, Bangalore Taluk; B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO, Special Interests; B. CHOODE GOWDA, Closepet Taluk; S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA and Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; Patel HANUME GOWDA, Dodballapur Taluk; GURUSWAMY GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk; S. SARABHANNA, Anekal Taluk; B. MALLAPPA and A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA, Nelamangala Taluk; T. THIMMARAYAPPA and Patel HONNASIDDIAH, Magadi Taluk; A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA, Closepet Municipality; K. P. PARASIVIAH, Kankanhalli Municipality; and K. NARAYANA SETTY Magadi Municipality.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA prayed that village panchayat boards, under the presidentship of the Amildar or Deputy Amildar as the case might be, should be constituted for each taluk or subtaluk and that village panchayat conferences be held once a month or a quarter or a half year, at which a representative from each village or group of villages would be present to review the work done and the work to be done in each of the panchayats in the taluk. This would help all the panchayats to compare notes and effect improvements by emulating one another. Such conferences were being held formerly. If these were revived, perhaps it might not be necessary even to pay travelling allowances. He hoped that the suggestion would receive the favourable consideration of Government.

The PRESIDENT said that that the suggestion would be sympathetically considered.

No. 78.—Collection of panchayat taxes through the Revenue Department.

Messrs. BALE GOWDA and REVANNA GOWDA, Kunigal Taluk; K. V. SUBRAMANYASWAMI, Kunigal Municipality.

Mr. BALE GOWDA represented that the object of the village panchayat scheme had been frustrated owing to the accumulation of heavy arrears of panchayat taxes. He prayed that hence forward the taxes be ordered to be collected through the Revenue Department as in the case of railway cess, education cess and irrigation cess, and the amounts handed over to the concerned panchayats with a view to facilitate their proper working.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA stated that the representation had the support of almost the entire House.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that Government also were of the same opinion and that action was being taken as desired.

No. 77.—Deposits in municipal elections

Mr. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA Malur Taluk.

Mr. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA prayed that orders be passed requiring every member standing for election in minor municipalities to make a deposit along with his application, as in the case of elections to the District Boards, the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council.

Messrs. T. MADIAH GOWDA, K. VENKATARAMIAH and many others supported the representation.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG, in further supporting the representation, said that a deposit of Rs. 25 should be required to be made by every candidate standing for election to a minor municipal council or a village panchayat. He added that as there was no difference between the Minor Municipalities Regulation and the Village Panchayat Regulation so far as qualifications of candidates were concerned, deposits should be insisted upon equally in both the cases.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) said that there would be no objection to accept the suggestion so far as elections to minor municipal councils were concerned, but that it was not considered necessary to take similar action in the case of elections to village panchayats at present.

No. 49.—Establishment of dispensaries at all hobli headquarters.

Messrs. B. L. BYANNA and C. N. NARASINGA RAO, Bangalore City Municipality; B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY, Bangalore Taluk; B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO, Special Interests; T. MADIAH GOWDA, Channapatna Taluk; B. CHOODE GOWDA, Closepet Taluk; S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA and Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; Patel HANUME GOWDA, Dodballapur Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hosakote Taluk; A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk; S. SARABHANNA, Anekal Taluk; B. MALLAPPA and A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA, Nelamangala Taluk; Patel HONNASIDDIAH, Magadi Taluk; A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA, Closepet Municipality; K. P. PARASIVIAH, Kankanhalli Municipality and K. NARAYANA SETTY, Magadi Municipality.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA represented that the absence of medical aid was being keenly felt in rural parts, especially during epidemics. He prayed that arrangements be made for the establishment of dispensaries at all hobli headquarters with a midwife attached to each of them.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that Government were doing all that they could in the matter.

No. 69.—Improvement of supply of water in Hanumanthapur Nala.

Mr. H. B. BASAPPA, Heggaddevanakote Taluk.

On behalf of the Mover, Mr. N. Bhogi MALLIAH represented that regarding the non-supply of water from the Hanumanthapur Nala drawn from Hanagodu Channel for wet cultivation in Heggaddevanakote Taluk, Government had been pleased to give an assurance at the last Dasara Session of the Assembly that the supply of water would be regulated by opening one or two more sluices, that a public works sub-division would be established to

supervise the supply and that the difficulty felt for water by the raiyats of both the Hunsur and Heggaddevankote taluks would be removed. It was learnt that the proposal for forming a sub-division at Heggaddevanakote had been dropped. He prayed that more sluices be opened as promised and that a sub-division be formed, to redress the grievances of the raiyats.

The PRESIDENT replied that the matter would be considered.

No. 55.—Abolition of the Middle School Public Examination.

Messrs. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA and **A. N. RAMA RAO**, Special Interests; **B. L. BYANNA** and **C. N. NARASINGA RAO**, Bangalore City Municipality; **B. MUNIVENKATAPPA** and **N. APPANNA REDDY**, Bangalore Taluk; **T. MADIAH GOWDA**, Channapatna Taluk; **B. CHOODE GOWDA**, Closepet Taluk; **S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA** and **Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA**, Kankanhalli Taluk; **Patel HANUME GOWDA**, Dodballapur Taluk; **GURUSWAMI GOWDA**, Hoskote Taluk; **A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA**, Devanhalli Taluk; **S. SARABHANNA**, Anekal Taluk; **B. MALLAPPA** and **A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA**, Nelamangala Taluk; **Patel HONNASIDDIAH**, Magadi Taluk; **A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA**, Closepet Municipality; **K. P. PARASIVIAH**, Kankanhalli Municipality; and **K. NARAYANA SETTY**, Magadi Municipality.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO prayed that the middle school public examination be abolished since it caused undue strain on young students without any corresponding advantage. He added that in all western countries, as also in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies, boys of less than 10 years of age were not being subjected to any difficult examinations.

Mr. S. C. BELURIAH supported the representation.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) replied that the representation raised a very important question of principle whether, in view of the tender age of students appearing for the middle school public examination, it was necessary or not to make the examination compulsory. The middle school public examination was a very old institution and for some reason it was still in force in the State. Now that it no longer existed in many of the provinces, the question whether in Mysore also it should not be discontinued in future would be examined.

No. 54.—Maintenance of primary school buildings in rural areas in proper condition.

Messrs. A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA and **B. MALLAPPA**, Nelamangala Taluk; **B. L. BYANNA** and **C. N. NARASINGA RAO**, Bangalore City Municipality; **B. MUNIVENKATAPPA** and **N. APPANNA REDDY**, Bangalore Taluk; **B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR** and **A. N. RAMA RAO**, Special Interests; **T. MADIAH GOWDA**, Channapatna Taluk; **B. CHOODE GOWDA**, Closepet Taluk; **S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA** and **Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA**, Kankanhalli Taluk; **Patel HANUME GOWDA**, Dodballapur Taluk; **GURUSWAMI GOWDA**, Hoskote Taluk; **A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA**, Devanhalli Taluk; **S. SARABHANNA**, Anekal Taluk; **Patel HONNASIDDIAH**, Magadi Taluk; **A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA**, Closepet Municipality; **K. P. PARASIVIAH**, Kankanhalli Municipality and **K. NARAYANA SETTY**, Magadi Municipality.

Mr. A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA prayed that sufficient provision be made for the repair and upkeep of primary school buildings in rural areas and that the buildings be kept in a state of good repair.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether the concerned villages could not together manage to effect necessary repairs to the school buildings.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED SAB replied that if panchayat funds were permitted to be utilised for the purpose, they could keep the buildings in good condition, and not otherwise. The main difficulty, he said, was one of funds, as the School Boards, the District Boards and the Government were all pleading inability to provide funds for the same.

Mr. G. MALLANNA did not agree to the suggestion. He was of opinion that panchayat funds should not be utilised for purposes other than village improvement proper.

The PRESIDENT observed that maintenance of school buildings was a responsibility of District Boards and enquired whether it was not possible for those bodies to provide funds for the purpose from education cess collections.

Mr. G. MALLANNA pointed out that while it was possible for District Boards

to provide funds from education cess collections for the purpose, the procedure prescribed for the same was too cumbersome and difficult. First the sanitary inspector should submit an estimate. Then the School Board, after scrutiny, should forward it to the Director of Public Instruction. Then the Director must sanction it and forward it to the Public Works Department for execution. By the time all these formalities were observed, the year would have been out and the grant would have lapsed.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) promised to see that the procedure was simplified at least so far as ordinary repairs were concerned.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA pointed out that according to the Elementary Education Manual, it was not necessary that repair works should be done by the Department of Public Works. Circular instructions had been issued to the effect that Local Education Authorities could themselves sanction all such works, if necessary plans and estimates were submitted by the School Board. It was only in the case of original works, in which both the village Panchayats and the District Boards had to give their respective quotas, that there was some special procedure to be followed.

The PRESIDENT observed that he had seen for himself that many school buildings were in a very bad condition, that often they were not sufficiently commodious and that they were almost invariably ill-ventilated. Most of the schools thus stood in need of improvement and it was necessary that the procedure in respect of improvement works was not made to be too technical or too elaborate. He therefore promised that instructions would be issued to the effect that ordinary repairs, etc., not involving heavy cost might be got executed by the sanitary inspectors concerned, only larger works being entrusted to the Public Works Department.

No. 34.—Amendment of the Limitation Act.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO, Bangalore City Municipality.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO pointed out that a decree-holder usually had 12 years' time to take possession of the property in respect of which he had obtained the decree. But in cases in which the decree-holder himself happened to be the auction-purchaser, only 3 years' time was being allowed to him, the period being calculated from the date of the decree, to take possession of the decretal property. If possession was not taken within that period, the decree-holder had to forfeit all his claims and he could not even get the decree renewed. It could not have been the intention of the Legislature that decree-holders should be subjected to such a disability and the provision in this respect must have been made for some technical reasons obtaining in the past. At present, however, there was no reason why such a restriction should be placed on decree-holders, and the member therefore prayed that the Limitation Act be so amended that when the decree-holder himself happened to be the auction-purchaser also, the period of limitation for obtaining possession of the property be the same as in the case of stranger-purchasers.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH supported the representation and suggested that retrospective effect should be given while amending the Act.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantra pravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) pointed out that the High Court who had been consulted in the matter had opined that there was an apparent difference of treatment as between cases in which auction-purchasers were other than decree-holders and cases in which decree-holders themselves happened to be auction-purchasers, but that such difference was not being made at the present time. The High Court had also proposed that the next time such a question came up before them, they would clarify the position and give a final decision. So the question of amending the Act might be taken up after the matter was gone into once more by the High Court and a reference made to the Government.

At this stage, the House rose for the day to meet again at 8 a.m., on Sunday, 20th June 1937.